



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/782,964	02/14/2001	Julian Orbanes	GPH-003G	9243

7590 12/02/2004
GeoPhoenix, Inc.
52 Trowbridge Street, #5
Cambridge, MA 02139

EXAMINER


TRAN, MYLINH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2179

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/782,964	Applicant(s) ORBANES ET AL. 	
	Examiner Mylinh T Tran	Art Unit 2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 May 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's Amendment filed 05/13/04 has been entered and carefully considered. Claims 1-6, 9-16 and 18 have been amended. Limitations of amended claims have not been found to be patentable over prior art of record, therefore, claims 1-20 are rejected under the same ground of rejection as set forth in the Office Action mailed 11/10/03.

Double Patenting

The "Double Patenting" rejection is still maintained. Please see paragraph 2 of Office Action mailed 11/10/03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Strasnick et al.[US. 5,671,381].

As to claims 1, 5-6 and 16, Strasnick et al. discloses employing a plurality of data objects contained within a data source (column 6, lines 42-55); employing a spatial paradigm for defining hierarchical relationships between said data objects (column 2, lines 20-30 and column 6, lines 17-25); generating a plurality of display screens that are included as a part of said

spatial paradigm (figure 4A, each cell is a display screen and contains data, column 4, lines 22-34), each display screen including a virtual representation of one or more of said data objects arranged (column 4, lines 22-34), at least in part, in dependence on said spatial paradigm and enabling a user to navigate from a first display screen to a second display screen within said spatial paradigm without losing context. Although Strasnick et al. discloses data to be viewed of the display screen, they do not explicitly mention about a more or less detailed view of the display screens. It is well known in the state of the art that the display screen could contain less or more data to be viewed. **The Examiner takes OFFICAL NOTICE.** It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Strasnick et al., the display screens contain data blocks to be a more or less detailed view of the display screens in order for presenting a large or small number of data information, as made known in the state of the art.

As to claims 2 and 17, Strasnick et al. also discloses the step of generating a plurality of display screens further comprises optimizing said appearance of each of said display screens for a rectangular display of a handheld client (figure 2B, boxes 280, 285 and 290 are rectangular shapes).

As to claims 3 and 18, Strasnick et al. shows defining within the first display screen a travel region, said travel region corresponding said second of said display screens according to said hierarchical relationship, and displaying

Art Unit: 2179

said second display screen to said user in response to said user selecting said travel region (column 20, line 42 through column 21, line 44).

As to claims 4, 19 and 20, Strasnick et al. shows employing vector graphics or raster graphics in defining said virtual representation (column 10, lines 42-68).

As to claim 7, Strasnick et al. also shows changing said virtual location to a second user location in response to said user (column 8, lines 1-10).

As to claim 8, Strasnick et al. provides displaying a second display screen corresponding to said second location (column 11, lines 20-38).

As to claim 9, Strasnick et al. demonstrates transitioning from said first display screen to said second display screen in a substantially continuous manner (column 8, lines 35-45 and column 11, lines 20-38).

As to claims 10 and 13, Strasnick et al. also demonstrates expanding and contracting said first display screen, and displaying, during said expansion and contracting of said first display screen, said second display screen (column 11, lines 7-68).

As to claims 11 and 14, Strasnick et al. discloses the step of expanding comprises scaling said first display screen over time (column 7, lines 1-34).

As to claims 12 and 15, Strasnick et al. also discloses the step of scaling comprises at least one of linearly, sinusoidally or exponentially scaling said first display screen (column 11, lines 1-65).

Response to Arguments

Applicant has argues the navigation of Strasnick maintains neither the context nor the spatial paradigm when navigating from one cell to another. However, the argument is not persuasive. Applicant's attention is directed to the lines at column 4, lines 28-60, "Connectors represent the contextual relationships between cells...spatial relationship between the cells and data blocks in the landscape represents the structural relationships that exist in the underlying data. For example, the underlying data relationship may be hierarchical or relational.....The information landscape is navigable. A user may move around or navigate within the 3D data representation to alter the perspective and view of the displayed representation of the data...".

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action.

Art Unit: 2179

In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-4141. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8.00AM to 6.30PM.

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (571) 272-4136.

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit 2179


BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER